DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 620 JC 830 036

AUTHOR Zimmerman, Woodford W.
TITLE A Study of Faculty Perception of the Implementation of the Articulated Faculty Concept. Self-Study Report No. 3. Institutional Research Series 1981.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ. Lima Campus. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE 6 May 81
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *College Faculty; Departments; Interprofessional Relationship; Multicampus Colleges; Personnel Management; *Personnel Policy; Postsecondary Education; Professional Recognition; *Rewards; State Universities; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Articulated Faculty Concept

ABSTRACT

In 1975 and 1981, surveys were conducted at the Lima regional campus of Ohio State University (OSU) to determine the perceptions of tenured and nontenured faculty with regard to the articulated faculty concept, whereby regional campus instructors are fully affiliated with academic departments at the OSU central campus. Faculty were asked to indicate: (1) the level of their understanding of the concept; (2) the extent to which certain benefits were associated with the articulated faculty concept (i.e., prestige; salary benefits; professional interaction with central campus staff; professional contacts at state and national levels; encouragement and support in teaching, research/creative work, and professional service; assistance in securing materials; and future professional mobility); (3) the importance of each benefit; and (4) the ideal and existing weights given to teaching, research, and service in the promotion and tenure process. Responses from 22 tenured and 15 nontenured faculty to the 1981 survey revealed a high degree of understanding of the articulated faculty concept. Prestige, encouragement and support in research and creative work, professional interaction with departmental colleagues, and national-level professional contacts were strongly associated with the concept. Tenured and nontenured groups felt that the relative weights of teaching, research, and service should be altered in the promotion and tenure process. Comparisons with 1975 findings and the questionnaire are included. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225620

OSU The Ohio State University at Lima

A STUDY OF FACULTY PERCEPTION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ARTICULATED FACULTY CONCEPT

Self-Study Report No. 3

Institutional Research Series 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. W. Zimmerman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Woodford W. Zimmerman
Associate Dean
May 6, 1981

UC 830 036

A Study of Faculty Perception of the
Implementation of the Articulated Faculty Concept

"The faculty cherishes the prestige of affiliation with a major university."[1] This statement appears in the report made by the evaluation team which represented the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for an on-site visit to The Ohio State University Lima Campus in February, 1972. The observation that the resident instructional staff "cherishes" the prestige of being a part of the faculty of The Ohio State University served as an impetus for studies conducted on the campus in 1975 and 1981.

To collect data for the first study, the "Articulated Faculty Survey" instrument (Appendix) was developed and administered in 1975. The study was replicated in January, 1981. The primary focus in this report is on the results of the 1981 study; however, several comparisons between the 1975 and 1981 findings will be made.

Background

The affiliation of Ohio State's regional campus faculty members with the University faculty extends beyond nominal membership. The academic organization idea referred to as the articulated faculty concept was conceived and has been developed to maximize potential benefits to students, the regional campus, the university, and to the individual faculty members through the full affiliation of regional campus faculty as members of the individual academic departments.

The subject of faculty articulation was first discussed at a meeting of regional campus directors and the Dean of University College on August 30, 1966,[2]

---

[1] North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Commission on Higher Education, "Report of Examination for Accreditation . . . Lima Campus of The Ohio State University," February, 1971, p. 24.

[2] Zimmerman, Richard H., "Faculty Articulation," unpublished paper [1969], p. 1.

just a few days before the first classes met on the new campuses at Lima and Mansfield. The point was made at that time and several times thereafter, that University College[3] supported the concept that "faculty people need to be fully affiliated with the parent instructional unit on the Columbus Campus."[4]

The notion of full affiliation of regional campus faculty members with the several departments of the university is brought into focus especially during the process for recruitment and selection of new faculty members and during the evaluation associated with the granting of tenure and promotion. Details of the relationship between OSU instructional units and the regional campuses appears as a policy statement issued by the then acting Provost of the University, Albert J. Kuhn, in November, 1971. The extent of the full affiliation of the regional campus faculty members with their several departments is forcefully presented in the policy statement:

> The primary responsibility for evaluation of regional campus faculty rests with department chairmen. As an aid in this matter, each regional campus director shall, at least once a year, submit to the appropriate chairman a written evaluation for each faculty member on his campus . . . It is expected that the same criteria [as publicly stated by the appropriate department] will be applied in evaluating the faculty on the regional campuses and on the central campus. While appropriate scholarship and research are encouraged, the relative emphasis on teaching and service expected at a regional campus will ordinarily be greater.[5]

Although one might assume that regional campus faculties might have moved away from a strong affiliation with home departments in the fifteen years of the campuses' existance, this has not happened. As the regional campuses became more mature institutions with more highly qualified faculty, regional campus faculty members have become more fully integrated into the fabric of the larger

---

[3]Prior to the formation of the Office of Regional Campuses in 1970, University College had administrative responsibility for the regional campuses at Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark.

[4]Ibid., p. 1

[5]Kuhn, Albert J., "The Relationship of The Ohio State University Instructional Units and OSU Regional Campuses," November, 1971, p. 2.

university faculty. However, this assimilation has not been uniform--a fact which is substantiated by this particular research study.

It should be emphasized that two fairly recent studies have revealed that there is considerable support for continuing and strengthening the close affiliation of regional campus faculty members with their departments. Both the Regional Campus Review Panel[6] in 1977 and the Task Force on Teaching[7] in 1979 have made general and specific suggestions which would strengthen the relationship between regional campus faculty members and the departments of instruction.

The Survey Instrument

The surveys conducted in 1975 and 1981 provide data on faculty perceptions on a variety of topics, all believed to have some relationship to the articulated faculty concept. The data should be useful in providing a better understanding of perceptions, motivational factors, present levels of understanding, strengths of the articulated faculty concept, and areas of needed improvement.

The survey instrument is comprised of four elements. First, an attempt is made to determine the level of understanding of the concept. Second, faculty members are asked to identify the extent to which they believe each of the ten factors is a benefit of the articulated faculty concept. Third, respondents are to indicate what they believe to be the importance of each factor. Finally, the participants are to indicate what they perceive to be the relative weights given to teaching, research, and service in the promotion and tenure review process. Additionally, they are asked what they believe the relative weights should be in the process.

---

[6] An eleven-member panel selected from throughout the university (faculty and administration, Columbus campus, and regional campuses) to study the regional campuses and report to the Provost.

[7] A six-member Task Force to follow up on Review Panel findings.

Understanding of the Articulated Faculty Concept

Participants in both the 1975 and 1981 studies were asked to indicate the degree to which they understood the articulated faculty concept. Responses were given on a five point scale extending from "very clear" to "very confused." When comparisons are made between the two groups, substantial differences are observed (Table 1). Among the 1981 tenured participants, there appears to be a relatively high degree of understanding of the concept, since approximately 70 percent indicate a very clear or clear understanding and just 5 percent report a very confused understanding of the concept. These responses reveal an improvement when compared with the 1975 group, when only 45 percent were clear or very clear in their understanding and 13 percent were very confused.

TABLE 1
FACULTY UNDERSTANDING OF THE ARTICULATED FACULTY CONCEPT--1975 AND 1981
(In Percentages)

	Degree of Understanding				
Group	Very Clear	Clear	Neutral	Confused	Very Confused
1975-Tenured (N=7)	29	14	43		14
1975-Non-tenured (N=26)	8	27	15	23	27
1981-Tenured (N=22)	20	50	25		5
1981-Non-tenured (N=15)	13	27	13	27	20

Changes in OSU Lima faculty have been considerable since 1971[8], and even since 1975. Some changes come from an actual change in personnel, while others are the result of the professional development of individuals who have

[8] "A Report of Faculty and Instructional Staff Resources" (1971).

been on the campus for six or more years. All tenured members of the 1981 group would have held an appointment on the campus in 1975; therefore, changes in the level of understanding result, in part, from knowledge gained by professors during the promotion and tenure review process, committee participation on the central campus, research support from the departments and through the OSU Research Foundation, and from other sources.

The changes in the makeup of the faculty also are revealed in the proportion of tenured and non-tenured faculty members responding to the two surveys. In 1975, 21 percent of the respondents were tenured, while in 1981 59 percent were in that category. This dramatic increase in the percentage of tenured faculty members suggests that comparisons between the total groups in 1975 and 1981 could be misleading; therefore, comparisons, when made, will usually be between the two tenured or the two non-tenured groups.

Relationship of Factors to Articulated Faculty Concept

Faculty members were presented with ten factors believed to have some relationship with The Ohio State University's implementation of faculty articulation on its regional campuses. The factors range from personal ones (prestige, salary, and mobility) to professional contacts (at departmental, state, and national levels) and include the traditional elements of the University faculty assignment (teaching, research, and service). The ten factors, arranged in rank order according to the perceived association with the articulated faculty concept and as determined by the pooled responses, are presented in Table 2.

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed these factors to be benefits associated with the articulated faculty concept. The extent of perceived relationships between the factors and faculty articulation was indicated on a five point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

TABLE 2
RANKING OF FACTORS AS ASSOCIATED WITH
THE ARTICULATED FACULTY CONCEPT
(TOTAL GROUP 1981)

Factor	Rank	Value (Range 1-5)	Agreement
Provides me with prestige	1	3.81	agree
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	2	3.62	agree
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	3	3.49	agree
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	4	3.38	agree
Provides me with salary benefits	5	3.23	neutral
Provides professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	6	3.19	neutral
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	7	3.17	neutral
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	8	2.97	neutral
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	9	2.73	neutral
Provides me with encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	10	2.56	neutral

Values: Agree, 4.2-5; Agree, 3.4-4.1; Neutral, 2.6-3.3, Disagree, 1.8-2.5; Strongly Disagree, 1-1.7.

When responses are pooled, four factors are found to fall in the "agree" range and the remaining six in the "neutral" range. Two of the items, however, are near the bottom of the neutral range (professional mobility and the service component). In fact, these two are the only two items falling below the mid-point of the total range (1-5). For the total group, no factor is categorized as "strongly agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree" in terms of being a benefit associated with faculty articulation.

The responses of individuals do, however, range from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" for each of the ten factors (Table 3), with the modal response being the "agree" category. The highest loading of responses is found for item one (prestige) where 49 percent of those responding indicate that they agree with the statement, and item two (salary) where 51 percent indicate a neutral condition.

For the tenured group in 1981, four items fall in the agree range (the same as for the total group), five in the neutral range, and one in the disagree range (Table 4). In general, faculty members do not perceive a positive relationship between the articulated faculty concept and the level of encouragement in the service component of faculty service.

The non-tenured group in 1981 perceive the situation somewhat differently from the tenured group (Table 4). They strongly agree with one statement (salary), agree with four, disagree with one, and categorize five as being neutral. The two groups reveal similar perceptions on six factors and somewhat different perceptions on four (salary, national contact, service component, and instructional materials/supplies).

TABLE 3
FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE
RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED FACTORS TO
THE ARTICULATED FACULTY CONCEPT
(TOTAL GROUP-1981)
(In Percentages)

Factor	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Provides me with prestige	24	49	19	0	8
Provides me with salary benefits	5	27	51	3	14
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	27	32	16	11	14
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	22	24	14	32	8
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	19	41	16	8	16
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	11	24	32	16	16
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	35	24	19	11	11
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	6	17	32	22	24
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	19	25	29	8	19
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	14	16	24	22	24
TOTALS	18	29	25	13	15

TABLE 4
AGREEMENT WITH ARTICULATED FACULTY/FACTORS STATEMENTS
(TENURED AND NON-TENURED GROUPS--1981)

Factor	Tenured	Non-Tenured
Provides me with prestige	agree	agree
Provides me with salary benefits	neutral	strongly agree
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	agree	agree
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	neutral	neutral
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	agree	neutral
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	neutral	neutral
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	agree	agree
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	disagree	neutral
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	neutral	agree
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	neutral	neutral

Importance of the Factors

Participants in both the 1975 and 1981 studies were asked to indicate the importance of each of the ten factors. Responses were made on a five point continuum extending from "very important" to "very unimportant." In Table 5, the ten factors are presented in rank order as determined by the total group in 1981. For this group all ten factors except salary are rated as being important or very important. Two factors (encouragement in the research/creative area and encouragement toward more effective teaching) are identified as being very important.

When comparisons are made between the tenured and non-tenured 1981 respondents, some expected differences are found (Table 6). While there is agreement on six factors, non-tenured faculty members ascribe more importance to four of the factors than do tenured respondents. Tenured faculty members rate two factors as very important, seven as important, and one as neutral. Non-tenured participants in the study place five in the very important range and five in the important range.

Responses to the importance question are considerably less dispersed than are those for the benefits question for both the tenured and non-tenured groups in 1981. The distribution of responses for the total 1981 group appear in Table 7.

Comparisons Between 1975 and 1981

Relationship of Factors to the Articulated Faculty Concept. When responses of tenured faculty members in 1975 and 1981 are compared, six factors remain at the same level of agreement as to their being identified as benefits of the articulated faculty concept (Table 8). Two have a higher level of agreement in 1981 and two have a higher level of agreement in 1975. Salary and professional contacts at the national level increased one level between 1975 and 1981 while

TABLE 5
IMPORTANCE RANKING OF FACTORS
(TOTAL GROUP-1981)

Factor	Rank	Value (Range 1-5)	Importance
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	1.5	4.39	very important
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	1.5	4.39	very important
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	3	4.11	important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	4	4.08	important
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	5	4.06	important
Provides me with prestige	6	3.83	important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	7	3.78	important
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	8	3.64	important
Provides encouragement and support for the service component of my professional life	9	3.40	important
Provides me with salary benefits	10	2.89	neutral

Importance Values: Very Important, 4.2-5; Important, 3.4-4.1; Neutral, 2.6-3.3; Unimportant, 1.8-2.5; Very Unimportant, 1-1.7.

TABLE 6
IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS
(TENURED AND NON-TENURED GROUPS--1981)

Factor	Tenured	Non-Tenured
Provides me with prestige	important	important
Provides me with salary benefits	important	important
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	important	very important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	important	important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	important	important
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	very important	very important
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	very important	very important
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	neutral	important
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	important	very important
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	important	very important

TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES INDICATING
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FACTORS
(TOTAL GROUP-1981)
(In Percentages)

Factor	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
Provides me with prestige	25	56	14	0	5
Provides me with salary benefits	40	30	22	3	5
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	37	40	18	0	5
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	27	41	22	5	5
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	38	40	14	8	0
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	58	28	11	0	3
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	58	28	11	0	3
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	11	34	43	6	6
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	39	36	19	3	3
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	31	33	22	6	8
TOTALS	36	37	20	3	4

TABLE 8
AGREEMENT WITH ARTICULATED FACULTY/FACTORS STATEMENTS
(TENURED GROUPS--1975 AND 1981)

Factor	1975	1981
Provides me with prestige	agree	agree
Provides me with salary benefits	disagree	neutral
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	agree	agree
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	neutral	neutral
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	neutral	agree
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	agree	neutral
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	agree	agree
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	disagree	disagree
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	agree	neutral
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	neutral	neutral

encouragement towards being a better teacher and assistance in securing materials/supplies for teaching and research decreased one level.

Among the non-tenured participants in the study, five factors remain at the same level from 1975 to 1981 and five show a positive movement (Table 9). For example, in 1981 non-tenured faculty members believe salary to be strongly associated with faculty articulation. In 1975 the non-tenured group indicated a neutral relationship. When responses for the non-tenured group of 1981 are compared with the responses of the comparable group in 1975, no factor is found to have decreased in the perceived benefits resulting from faculty articulation.

Importance of the Factors. When a comparison is made between the responses of the tenured groups in 1975 and 1981, agreement is found on six of the ten items (Table 10) in terms of importance. However, four of the factors are judged as being more important in 1981 than they were in 1975. Those factors considered more important by the 1981 group are prestige, professional contact on the state level, encouragement to become a more effective teacher, and encouragement in the research/creative dimension of the faculty assignment.

Very little change in the responses of the non-tenured groups appears between 1975 and 1981. Nine of the ten factors fall in the same ranges in the two years (Table 11). One factor (interaction with central campus faculty members) moves from the important level in 1975 to the very important level in 1981. The ten factors in 1981, as perceived by the non-tenured group, are equally divided between the important and very important categories.

Some Apparent Strengths of the Articulated Faculty Concept

Most descriptions of the articulated faculty concept cite the academic and programmatic advantages to the student. A well-qualified faculty, potential transferability of credits, and overall academic quality are believed to be benefits of this approach to academic organization. However, in this study, the

TABLE 9
AGREEMENT WITH ARTICULATED FACULTY/FACTORS STATEMENTS
(NON-TENURED GROUPS--1975 AND 1981)

Factor	1975	1981
Provides me with prestige	agree	agree
Provides me with salary benefits	neutral	strongly agree
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	neutral	agree
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	neutral	neutral
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	neutral	neutral
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	neutral	neutral
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	neutral	agree
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	disagree	neutral
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	neutral	agree
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	neutral	neutral

TABLE 10
IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS
(TENURED GROUPS--1975 AND 1981)

Factor	1975	1981
Provides me with prestige	neutral	important
Provides me with salary benefits	important	important
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	important	important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	neutral	important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	important	important
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	important	very important
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	important	very important
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	neutral	neutral
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	important	important
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	important	important

TABLE 11
IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS
(NON-TENURED GROUPS--1975 AND 1981)

Factor	1975	1981
Provides me with prestige	important	important
Provides me with salary benefits	important	important
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	important	very important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level	important	important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	important	important
Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher	very important	very important
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	very important	very important
Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life	important	important
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	very important	very important
Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)	very important	very important

topic is approached in a different manner, with the focus being upon the faculty member and how he or she perceives the articulated faculty concept as a functioning professional.

From the faculty member's perspective, it is suggested that some factors have a position of special significance. For the total group in 1981, four factors not only receive high ratings as benefits of the articulated faculty concept, but also high ratings in importance (Table 12). Prestige, encouragement in the research/creative area, professional interaction with the departmental members, and contact on the national level are believed to be important while also being a benefit of Ohio State's regional campus faculty structure.

TABLE 12
FACTORS RECEIVING HIGH RANKINGS
IN BOTH BENEFITS AND IMPORTANCE
(TOTAL GROUP-1981)

Factor	Agreement	Importance
Provides me with prestige	agree	important
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	agree	very important
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	agree	important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	agree	important

Among the tenured faculty members in 1981, three factors are perceived as being benefits of the articulated faculty concept and are considered important as well (Table 13). These three factors are among the four identified by the total group in 1981. The exception is the absence of the prestige factor for the tenured group, who view prestige as being of less importance.

TABLE 13
FACTORS RECEIVING HIGH RANKINGS
IN BOTH BENEFITS AND IMPORTANCE
(TENURED GROUP-1981)

Factor	Agreement	Importance
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	agree	very important
Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level	agree	important
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	agree	important

For the non-tenured group in 1981, five factors appear to have special significance (Table 14). Two of the five factors (departmental contacts and encouragement in the research/creative area) are common to the tenured and non-tenured groups. Prestige, salary, and securing of materials/supplies appears to be more significant for the non-tenured than for the tenured group.

Teaching, Research, and Service

The final section of the Articulated Faculty survey deals with the three components of the total faculty work-load: teaching, research/creative work, and service. The importance of faculty perceptions in these areas led to the development of a different approach from that employed earlier in the survey and one which not only would provide for a more in-depth study but which also could offer an opportunity for cross-validation.

The supportive relationship of the articulated faculty concept toward faculty endeavors in these three areas was reported earlier. The implementation of the articulated faculty concept, it will be recalled, is believed to be much more

TABLE 14
FACTORS RECEIVING HIGH RANKINGS
IN BOTH BENEFITS AND IMPORTANCE
(NON-TENURED GROUP-1981)

Factor	Agreement	Importance
Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department	agree	very important
Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/creative work	agree	very important
Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research	agree	very important
Provides me with salary benefits	strongly agree	important
Provides me with prestige	agree	important

supportive in the area of research than in the area of service. These findings are further substantiated in the final part of the survey.

Participants were asked to determine the relative values placed on teaching, research/creative work, and service by their departments in making promotion and tenure recommendations for regional campus faculty members. Since nearly forty faculty members representing more than twenty departments responded, a divergence of responses was expected, and clearly occurred.

Tenured faculty members report that they believe that teaching accounts for approximately 36 percent of the promotion and tenure decision (Table 15), with the range of responses falling between a low of 10 percent to a high of 80 percent. In contrast, they believe that teaching should account for 52 percent of the promotion and tenure decision. The ideal values ("should be") range from 33 percent to 80 percent. The perception of the non-tenured group is almost identical (Table 16).

TABLE 15
A COMPARISON OF 1975 AND 1981 RESPONSES
TO RELATIVE EMPHASIS ON THREE
TRADITIONAL SERVICES AREAS
TENURED GROUPS
(In Percentages)

	1975		1981	
	is	should be	is	should be
Teaching	35	68	36	52
Research/creative	58	21	53	29
Service	6	11	11	19

TABLE 16
A COMPARISON OF 1975 AND 1981 RESPONSES
TO RELATIVE EMPHASIS ON THREE
TRADITIONAL SERVICE AREAS
NON-TENURED GROUPS
(In Percentages)

	1975		1981	
	is	should be	is	should be
Teaching	36	52	35	52
Research/creative	53	29	53	27
Service	11	19	12	21

Tenured faculty members perceive that more weight (53 percent) is given to research/creative work than to teaching. The range in this case is from a low of 10 percent to a high of 80 percent. The ideal weigh. for the research area, as determined by computing the mean percentage, would be 29 percent. Again, responses of the non-tenured group are almost identical.

Finally, the tenured faculty members perceive that the value given to the service component (11 percent) is not far from the ideal (15 percent). For the non-tenured group, there is a 9 percentage point difference between what is presently perceived and the value which should be given the service component (12 percent as compared with 21 percent).

Not unexpectedly, some changes in perceptions have occurred since the first study was conducted in 1975. Among the tenured faculty, the gap between what is perceived to be and what should be has narrowed considerably (Table 15). This narrowing results from the decreased relative importance of teaching and the increased relative importance of research and service under "ideal" conditions. For the tenured group, the approximate weights given to the three elements should be: teaching, 50 percent; research, 30 percent; and service, 20 percent.

Among the non-tenured respondents there was little change between 1975 and 1981. In fact, the approximate weights assigned by the non-tenured groups in both studies are almost identical to those of the tenured group in 1981. In the existing condition, the non-tenured group perceives the following weights being assigned in the tenure and promotion process: teaching, 35 percent; research/creative, 55 percent; and service, 10 percent. For this group the ideal weights would be: teaching, 50 percent; research/creative, 30 percent; and service, 20 percent.

Summary

Faculty members in 1981 exhibit a relatively high degree of understanding of the articulated faculty concept. This is epsecially true among the tenured respondents, and even truer in comparison with faculty members who participated in the 1975 study.

Faculty in the 1981 total group cite the following as benefits strongly associated with the articulated faculty concept: prestige, encouragement and support in research and creative work, professional interaction with departmental colleagues, and professional contacts on the national level. Faculty members do not perceive a strong association between the articulated faculty concept and encouragement and support in the service component of their professional lives.

Tenured and non-tenured faculty members agree to a large extent on the benefits of the articulated faculty concept. Their greatest disagreement is on salary, which the non-tenured group perceives to be much more of a benefit than do the tenured faculty members.

Faculty members responding to the 1981 survey judge almost all of the factors identified as being important. Exceptions are salary (neutral) and encouragement in both research and teaching (very important). Again, there is a high degree of agreement between the tenured and non-tenured groups.

When the 1975 and 1981 tenured groups are compared for the relationships they perceived between the factors as benefits and the articulated faculty concept, a few small differences are noted. More differences are present when the two non-tenured groups are compared. All changes from 1975 to 1981 for the non-tenured group are positive, with five factors being identified more favorably as a benefit of the articulated faculty concept.

For the total group, four factors are perceived as being more important in 1981 than in 1975 (prestige, professional contacts at the state level, teaching, and research). Few changes in importance are noted for the non-tenured group.

Among both the tenured and non-tenured groups regarding the promotion and tenure decision, there is the feeling that the relative weights of teaching, research, and service should be altered. As groups, faculty members believe that teaching should have a weight of approximately 50 percent; research, 30 percent; and service, 20 percent.

A gap between what was perceived to be and what should be was observed in 1975; however, in 1975, it should be noted that the gap was even greater than in 1981. The convergence observed in the 1981 study results in large part from the perceived increase in the importance of research and service combined with a concomitant decrease of teaching as factors in the promotion and tenure decision making process. However, this result does not necessarily mean that the teaching act is of less importance for OSU Lima faculty members in 1981 than in 1975; and the 1981 respondents continue to believe that considerably more weight should be given to teaching effectiveness in the promotion and tenure review process than they perceive to be the case as it now exists. The observed convergence between the perceived existing conditions and the ideal conditions (for the tenured group) quite possibly results from faculty members who are less threatened by research requirements and who believe that they can be productive in all three traditional areas of the faculty assignment.

* * * * *

PLEASE RETURN BY FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5.

OSU Communication

Subject "Articulated Faculty" Concept

Date December 1, 1980

From W. W. Zimmerman WZ

To OSU Faculty

Some of you might recall that I conducted a survey on the "Articulated Faculty" concept approximately six years ago. I now wish to replicate that study and I am asking for your cooperation. A summary of the findings will be shared with Self-Study Committee B. An identification number is found on the lower right hand corner of the last page of the survey. Please return the survey to my secretary, Cathy Eley, who will clip the number from the survey and record that the survey has been returned. I will see no surveys with identifying numbers.

Please indicate your understanding of the "articulated faculty" concept on the continuum below:

_____/_____/_____/_____/_____

Very Clear Understanding — Very Confused Understanding

If you wish, please provide a definition of the term "articulated faculty" concept.

ce

PLEASE RETURN BY FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5.

26 - 29

The following items deal with possible benefits of the "articulated faculty" concept. In the left column indicate your agreement with the statement, and in the right column indicate the importance of this possible benefit to you.

SA-Strongly Agree
SD-Strongly Disagree

VI-Very Important
VU-Very Unimportant

1) Provides me with prestige

SA / / / / SD

1a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

2) Provides me with salary benefits

SA / / / / SD

2a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

3) Provides an opportunity for professional interaction with central campus faculty members in my department

SA / / / / SD

3a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

4) Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the state level

SA / / / / SD

4a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

5) Facilitates professional contacts and benefits for me in my discipline on the national level

SA / / / / SD

5a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

6) Provides encouragement and support toward my becoming a more effective teacher.

SA / / / / SD

6a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

7) Provides encouragement and support toward professional growth in terms of research/ creative work

SA / / / / SD

7a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

8) Provides encouragement and support in the service component of my professional life

SA / / / / SD

8a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

9) Provides assistance in securing helpful materials, supplies, etc. for teaching or research

SA / / / / SD

9a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

10) Provides me with professional mobility in terms of future position(s)

SA / / / / SD

10a) Importance to me

VI / / / / VU

* * * * * * * * * *

In making tenure and promotion recommendations for regional campus faculty members my department appears to value the three areas of service as follows:

Teaching	_____%
Research/creative work	_____%
Service	_____%
TOTAL	100%

For most persons on a regional campus I believe an appropriate distribution would be:

Teaching	_____%
Research/creative work	_____%
Service	_____%
TOTAL	100%

* * * * * * * * * *

Please check the appropriate statement

_____ I have tenure with The Ohio State University

_____ I do not have tenure with The Ohio State University

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

FEB 25 1983